

March 25, 2002

To: Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky, Chairman  
Supervisor Gloria Molina  
Supervisor Yvonne Brathwaite Burke  
Supervisor Don Knabe  
Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich

From: David E. Janssen  
Chief Administrative Officer

**FUNDING ALLOCATION FOR HIV/AIDS TREATMENT AND PREVENTION PROGRAMS  
(ITEMS NO. 23, 24 and 25, AGENDA OF MARCH 26, 2002)**

Item No. 23 on the March 26, 2002 agenda contains the Department of Health Services' (DHS) recommendations to accept and sign an agreement with the California Department of Health Services (CDHS) for HIV/AIDS program funds, delegate authority to the Director of Health Services to accept and sign amendments which do not exceed 25 percent of the base award, and approve an appropriation adjustment to include new funds in the Public Health Programs and Services 2001-02 Adopted Budget. Items 24 and 25 are DHS recommendations to approve and instruct the Director to sign new agreements and amendments to existing agreements for HIV/AIDS services. On March 19, 2002, your Board instructed my office to report back on the formula used to distribute AIDS funding countywide.

Background

The 2001-02 Adopted Budget for the Office of AIDS Programs and Policy (OAPP) includes \$67.0 million in federal and State funds from the Ryan White CARE Act Titles I and II, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), the Center for Substance Abuse Treatment (CSAT), the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (CSAP), the California Department of Health Services Office of AIDS, and other State funds. In addition, OAPP's budget includes \$15.9 million in County funds as the County's maintenance-of-effort requirement.

The recommendations in Items 24 and 25 relate to funds currently reflected in OAPP's 2001-02 Adopted Budget. The Master Grant Agreement in Item 23 includes federal and State funds for both treatment and prevention which are also reflected in OAPP's 2001-02 Adopted Budget, except for the augmentation of \$247,000. This augmentation represents new funding for the HIV Epidemiology Program in Public Health Programs and Services.

#### HIV/AIDS Allocation Methodologies

There are two basic methods utilized by OAPP to assess the appropriateness of the geographic distribution of HIV/AIDS funds countywide, based on an estimate of need. The first method is used to assess the geographic estimate of need for HIV/AIDS care and treatment funds, such as Title I and Title II funds. This method considers three equally weighted factors in each Service Planning Area (SPA): the number of individuals with AIDS living in the SPA; the number of AIDS diagnoses within the last two-year period by SPA; and the number of individuals living in the SPA at or below the federal poverty level. This method, along with a review of provider performance and availability of other funds, was considered by OAPP in recommending the use of care and treatment funds in the 31 amendments to existing agreements in Item 25 on your March 26, 2002 agenda.

The second method is used to assess the geographic estimate of need for prevention and education funds, such as CDC funds. This method considers six weighted factors, including the three factors considered in the first method: living AIDS cases; recent AIDS diagnoses; and poverty. The second method also considers three factors which indicate behavior associated with HIV risk or transmission: incidence of sexually transmitted diseases; substance abuse-related deaths; and the number of persons testing positive for HIV or reporting very high risk for HIV at a publicly funded site.

Each second method factor is weighted based on its indication of high-risk behavior and as a co-factor of HIV transmission and whether data for its incidence is reliable, available and consistent countywide. Attachment I shows the relative weight for these factors and the resulting averages for the eight SPAs. This second method, along with a review of provider proposals and availability of other funds, was considered by OAPP in recommending the 18 new agreements in Item 24 on your March 26, 2002 agenda.

In summary, the actual allocation of funds to service providers, whether County-operated or community-based, depends on OAPP's assessment of geographic need, their review of the quality of the providers' proposals or requests, e.g., through a Request for Proposal (RFP) bid process, and the availability of other funds in the area for HIV/AIDS care and treatment or prevention and education.

Each Supervisor  
March 25, 2002  
Page 3

If you have questions, please contact me or your staff may contact Sheila Shima at 974-1160.

DEJ:DIL  
SAS:bjs

Attachment

c:     Executive Officer, Board of Supervisors  
         County Counsel  
         Director of Health Services

# INDICATORS OF NEED - OFFICE OF AIDS PROGRAMS AND POLICIES

## PREVENTION AND EDUCATION

Service Planning Area	Sexually Transmitted Diseases	Recent AIDS Diagnoses	Living AIDS Cases	Substance Abuse	Counseling and Testing	Poverty
	<b>Numbers of Cases</b>					
1 Antelope Valley	632	20	167	406	620	42,708
2 San Fernando Valley	4,101	242	2,041	3,403	5,712	303,452
3 San Gabriel Valley	3,558	124	1,039	3,388	3,906	312,153
4 Metro	4,912	589	6,016	3,065	12,767	355,997
5 West	1,170	71	870	1,248	2,461	86,251
6 South	8,162	183	1,455	2,154	3,978	398,171
7 East	3,838	98	908	2,927	2,608	278,810
8 South Bay	3,843	257	2,352	3,034	4,095	272,202
<b>Total</b>	<b>30,216</b>	<b>1,584</b>	<b>14,848</b>	<b>19,625</b>	<b>36,147</b>	<b>2,049,744</b>

	<b>Percent of Total</b>					
1 Antelope Valley	2.1%	1.3%	1.1%	2.1%	1.7%	2.1%
2 San Fernando Valley	13.6%	15.3%	13.7%	17.3%	15.8%	14.8%
3 San Gabriel Valley	11.8%	7.8%	7.0%	17.3%	10.8%	15.2%
4 Metro	16.3%	37.2%	40.5%	15.6%	35.3%	17.4%
5 West	3.9%	4.5%	5.9%	6.4%	6.8%	4.2%
6 South	27.0%	11.6%	9.8%	11.0%	11.0%	19.4%
7 East	12.7%	6.2%	6.1%	14.9%	7.2%	13.6%
8 South Bay	12.7%	16.2%	15.8%	15.5%	11.3%	13.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

	<b>Associated Weight Factor</b>					
	23.0%	11.0%	22.0%	11.0%	11.0%	22.0%

	<b>Associated Weight Factor Applied to Percent of Total</b>						<b>Geographic Need</b>
1 Antelope Valley	0.48%	0.14%	0.25%	0.23%	0.19%	0.46%	1.7%
2 San Fernando Valley	3.12%	1.68%	3.02%	1.91%	1.74%	3.26%	14.7%
3 San Gabriel Valley	2.71%	0.86%	1.54%	1.90%	1.19%	3.35%	11.5%
4 Metro	3.74%	4.09%	8.91%	1.72%	3.89%	3.82%	26.2%
5 West	0.89%	0.49%	1.29%	0.70%	0.75%	0.93%	5.0%
6 South	6.21%	1.27%	2.16%	1.21%	1.21%	4.27%	16.3%
7 East	2.92%	0.68%	1.35%	1.64%	0.79%	2.99%	10.4%
8 South Bay	2.93%	1.78%	3.48%	1.70%	1.25%	2.92%	14.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23.0%</b>	<b>11.0%</b>	<b>22.0%</b>	<b>11.0%</b>	<b>11.0%</b>	<b>22.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>